

#### **IV. REMARKS**

1. Replacement drawings are attached hereto.
2. Claim 2 is cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 11 and 20 are amended.
3. Claim 16 is amended to address the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection.
4. Claims 1, 5 and 7-8 are not unpatentable over Widegren et al. ("Widegren"), Szabo et al. ("Szabo") and Coulouris under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claim 1 recites a method of managing bearer adapters and that the adding and deleting of a bearer adapter to and from the server is controlled by a "bearer gate" and that the "bearer gate" is configured to operate between the bearer adapter and the protocol stack. This is not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Widegren, Szabo and Coulouris.

It is submitted that the use of a bearer gate as described and claimed by Applicant is not disclosed by the combination of references. The Examiner states that Widegren discloses a bearer gate, referring to Col. 2, lines 61-64, Col. 3, lines 22-24, Col. 6, lines 20-21, Col. 9, lines 29-32 and Col. 13, lines 43-60. These portions of Widegren only discuss radio access bearers and do not disclose or suggest bearer gates. For example, Col. 6 lines 20-21 merely states that the RNC is responsible for bearer service. This is not the same as a bearer gate because a bearer gate is not responsible for bearer service, but rather is only a portion of the bearer service implementation. Generally, bearer gates can be used to translate requests. There is no such disclosure in the combination of references.

As described and claimed by Applicant, the bearer gate enables easier management of the threads and bearer adapters so that existing connections of the server are not disturbed. Thus, the bearer gate claimed by Applicant controls adding and deleting a bearer adapter to and from the server, and is configured to operate between the bearer

adapter and the protocol stack. The combination of references does not disclose or suggest such a bearer gate. Rather, Widegren, which is relied on by the Examiner for disclosing this feature, merely discusses radio access bearers, and not bearer gates. Thus, the features recited in claim 1 are not disclosed or suggested by the combination of references.

Claims 5, 7 and 8 should be allowable at least by reason of their respective dependencies.

5. Claim 6 is not unpatentable over Widegren and Szabo and further in view of Anderson et al. at least by reason of its dependency on claim 1, for the reasons noted above.

6. Claim 9 is not unpatentable over Widegren and Szabo in view of Chari at least by reason of its dependency on claim 7.

7. Claims 11, 15, 16, 18 and 20 are not unpatentable over Widegren, Szabo and Coulouris under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claim 11 is amended to recite subject matter similar to that recited in claim 1, and should also be allowable. Here again, there is no disclosure of a bearer gate as claimed by Applicant. Claim 11 recites a bearer gate that isolates the wireless protocol stack from the bearer adapters, stores information on the bearer adapters and operates between the bearer adapter and the protocol stack. The bearer gate is also configured to control the adding and deleting of the bearer adapter to and from the server. There is no such disclosure or suggestion in the combination of references, and thus claim 11 should be allowable. Claim 20 recites similar features and should be allowable for the same reasons.

Claims 15, 16 and 18 should be allowable at least by reason of their dependencies.

8. Claims 12 and 17 are not unpatentable over Widegren, Szabo Coulouris and Chari at least by reason of their respective dependencies.

9. Claims 10 and 19 are not unpatentable over Widegren, Szabo, Coulouris, Chari and Bucholz at least by reason of their respective dependencies.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Geza C. Ziegler, Jr.  
Reg. No. 44,004

6 December 2006  
Date

Perman & Green, LLP  
425 Post Road  
Fairfield, CT 06824  
(203) 259-1800  
Customer No.: 2512

### **CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited transmitted electronically, on the date indicated below, addressed to the Mail Stop AMENDMENT, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: 6 December 2006

Signature: Shannon D'Amico

Shannon D'Amico  
Person Making Deposit